

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application.

The Office Action of July 6, 2005, rejected all of the pending claims, Claims 1-20. The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,590,417 to Rydbeck (hereinafter "the Rydbeck patent") in view of U.S. Patent 5,666,661 to Grube et al. (hereinafter "the Grube patent"). Claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rydbeck patent in view of the Grube patent and in view of U.S. Patent 6,650,871 to Cannon et al. (hereinafter "the Cannon patent").

Independent Claims 1 and 11 have been further amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references and combinations of cited references. Additional amendments are also made to dependent Claims 2, 6, 16, 17, and 19 corresponding to amendments made to their respective parent claims. Applicant hereby adds Claims 21-31 to claim additional embodiments of the present invention.

Applicant provides the following remarks in response to the rejections of the Office Action and submits that the rejection of Claims 1 and 11 over the cited references is respectfully traversed for the reasons which follow.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rydbeck patent in view of the Grube patent. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that reliance upon the Grube patent for showing a plurality of access points is misplaced. Elements 106-112 of the Grube patent are identified as system communication resources. *See, e.g.*, col. 2, line 61. The Grube patent at column 1, lines 20-22 defines a communication resource to be "an RF channel, a pair of RF channels, a TDM slot, or any medium for carrying RF signals." In short, the communication resources refer to RF frequency channels, not to access points. The Grube patent fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of access points as recited in Claim 1, or the corresponding operation of coupling each of a plurality of access points in Claim 11.

Additionally, independent Claims 1 and 11 have each been amended to recite that the communication connectivity between the plurality of access points is pursuant to a second communications protocol. Even if the communication resources 106-112 disclosed in the Grube patent can be construed as access points, the Grube patent fails to disclose or suggest communications between access points pursuant to a second communications protocol while communications between the phone

and a wireless-headset-emulating access point and communications between the wireless headset and a phone-emulating access point are carried out pursuant to the first wireless communication protocol. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, e.g., on page 10, lines 15-17, page 12, line 1, and page 12, lines 2-4. Figure 2 further illustrates elements 203a-b and a LAN interface 202.

Therefore, both for the reason that the Grube patent fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of access points and also fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of access points that are in communication connectivity pursuant to a second communications protocol, the Grube patent also fails to disclose or suggest the structure or methodology to support its combination with the Rydbeck patent to form the invention, as now recited in independent Claims 1 and 11, and newly added independent Claims 21, 24, and 28.

The dependent claims, which include all the limitations of their respective parent claims, are also believed to be distinguishable over the combination of the Rydbeck patent and the Grube patent for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims. Claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rydbeck patent in view of the Grube patent and in view of the Cannon patent. The Cannon patent, used in combination with the Rydbeck patent and the Grube patent to reject various of the dependent claims was cited merely for showing communication between electronic devices using the Bluetooth™ protocol, also fails to disclose or suggest the plurality of access points connected in the communication connectivity pursuant to the second communications protocol, as recited now in the claims. Applicant further submits that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to combine the teaching of the Cannon patent with the Rydbeck and/or Grube patent in such a manner as to accomplish the claimed invention.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 11, as amended, and newly added independent Claims 21, 24, and 28, and the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration for allowance of these claims is, therefore, respectfully requested. Applicant submits that the remarks presented above overcome the § 103(a) rejections of the Office Action of July 6, 2005.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks presented above, Applicants submit that all of the pending Claims 1-31 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the amendments and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

Appl No.: 09/846,073
Amdt. Dated: November 4, 2005
Response to Office Action of July 6, 2005

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper, such as the fees for a request for an extension of time. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Gegg
Registration No. 50,857

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
CLT01/4761326v1

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 4, 2005


Joyce D. Smith

Remarks for Substitute Drawings:

Enclosed herewith are three replacement sheets of substitute drawings in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.81, 1.83, and 1.84. The drawing Figure 3B has been amended to correct the transition from 310 to 312 to be indicated as a “NO” response, as described in the specification. It is requested that these new drawings be substituted for the originally filed drawings.